DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 287 JC 850 060

AUTHOR Stetson, Nancy E.
TITLE The Development of an Historical Perspective on Private Financial Support for Public Two-Year Colleges. The Emergence of Higher Education in America.
PUB DATE Dec 84
NOTE 28p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges; *Educational Finance; *Educational History; Literature Reviews; *Private Financial Support; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS Public Colleges

ABSTRACT

In an effort to provide an overview of the history of private financial support to public two-year colleges, this paper presents a synthesis of 20 relevant publications and discusses the implications of the findings for fund-raising at the Marin Community Colleges (MCC). Following information on the purpose and methods of the study and its significance for MCC, a literature review is presented, indicating: (1) private gifts and funds accounted for no more than 3% of the revenue of public community colleges between 1918 and 1980; (2) individual public two-year colleges received an average of $85,450 each year from private gifts and grants during 1968 through 1971, the last years for which accurate data were available; (3) between 1960 and 1963, foundations were the source of most private financial support to community colleges, followed by non-alumni, corporations and businesses, and alumni; (4) community colleges increased their efforts to gain private financial support beginning in the late 1960's with resulting contributions of equipment, land, and buildings, but little increase in operating funds; and (5) private per capita aid to public community colleges decreased 15.5% between 1972-73 and 1979-80. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED253287

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Nancy Stetson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON PRIVATE FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

THE EMERGENCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN AMERICA

by

Nancy E. Stetson, M.S.

Marin Community College District

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

DECEMBER 1984

JC 850 060

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to develop a document which provided an historical perspective on private financial support to public two-year colleges. Staff at The Marin Community Colleges needed that perspective so that they could set realistic fundraising goals. Twenty articles, documents, and books on the topic were found through Dialog and in the community-college book section of the San Francisco State University library. Information gained by studying these materials was used to develop the document--the results section of this paper.

Findings of the study were that private gifts and grants accounted for no more than 3 percent of public two-year college revenue with no clear trend emerging; that non-alumni were the largest source of gifts and Alumni Funds were not effective in raising gifts for public two-year colleges; and that California community colleges tended to receive about one third the average dollar amount received by community colleges nationally.

Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that findings should be printed in The Colleges' manual on institutional development, and The Colleges should continue to focus on developing gifts from friends of The Colleges, rather than alumni, and organize their private fundraising efforts through The Colleges.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
Nature of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Method of Investigation	3
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	4
PROCEDURES	7
Limitations	8
Assumptions	9
RESULTS	9
DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
REFERENCES CITED	23

INTRODUCTION

Over the past sixty-five years, public two-year colleges have experienced an increased dependency on state aid and a decreased dependency on local aid. In 1980, these colleges derived 60 percent of their income from state aid and 11 percent from local aid (5). This was in sharp contrast to sources of income in 1918, when they derived 94 percent of their income from local aid. In recent years, many public two-year colleges have received inadequate funding from the state to meet local need. As a result, some are turning to their local communities for private support.

Nature of the Problem

Since the passage of Proposition 13, California community colleges have experienced an increased dependency on state aid. During 1983-84, The Marin Community Colleges--one of seventy community college districts in the state--experienced a 7 percent decrease in state funding over the previous year. In the spring of 1983, the District Board of Trustees directed the administration and the Development Committee of the Board to plan and implement a college-based program of private financial support which would assist the District maintain adequate support for programs and services. While The Colleges had a

twenty-year-old college-related separate foundation, the foundation limited itself to developing private financial support for student aid. Its directors did not wish to change the single-purpose orientation of the foundation. Therefore, the private fundraising program for programs and services was college based, rather than foundation based.

In July of 1983, The Colleges initiated their first private fundraising campaign. The year-long campaign resulted in cash and non-cash gifts and grants of more than a quarter of a million dollars which was perceived by the Director of Public Affairs and Development as a successful first-year effort. However, because College faculty and staff lacked an historical perspective from which to view this new venture, they expressed frustration with the first-year results. It was perceived by the Director that this frustration might have been due to a discrepancy between what they expected to accomplish, and what they accomplished. It also was perceived by the Director that their continued frustration likely would lead some participants to abandon their efforts, rather than build on the first year's success. The Director only had anecdotal information about the history of private support for public two-year colleges. A preliminary review of the literature revealed no single-source document which provided an historical perspective on the subject.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the history of private financial support to public two-year colleges in order to develop a single-source document which provided an historical perspective on the subject. The document was used in the development of an introductory chapter in a revised version of The Colleges' manual on institutional development. The manual is used as an aid in training College faculty and staff in policies, procedures, and techniques for developing gifts and grants.

Method of Investigation

A Dialog search was conducted for citations regarding private financial support for two-year colleges. Information about private financial support for college-related separate foundations was not sought. Of the thirty citations found in the search, twelve articles and documents yielded information relevant to the study. Eight additional sources of information were found by searching in indexes for entries under the term "private financial support" in all of the books grouped under the subject of "community colleges" on the shelves at the San Francisco State University library. These twenty articles, documents, and books were studied in detail and information gained in that study was used to develop a single-source document which provided an historical perspective on the subject. The results section of this paper is that document.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

A growing number of public two-year colleges are responding to the situation of increased dependency on the state and decreased access to local aid by initiating or increasing their efforts to develop cash and non-cash gifts and grants from the private sector. They are organizing in one of two ways to develop this capacity: through college-related separate foundations, or through the college itself. Regardless of which way they choose to organize, they encounter special problems, both because they are public and because they are two-year institutions.

Thornton (16) described the dilemma peculiar to the two-year public college when seeking public support.

> As community colleges assume an increasing share of rapidly growing college enrollments, their problems of inadequate financial support grow more acute. They are in competition with elementary and secondary schools for local property tax money and with state universities and colleges for income from the state treasury. At the local level, the numbers of students in the two-year community colleges are much smaller than in the 12 years of public schools, and so their claims for support are subordinated. In the competition for state revenues, on the other hand, they lack the prestige and the statewide appeal of the four-year institutions, and so find it difficult to secure adequate, not to say equal, appropriations (16:294).

Garms (9) described the dilemma which private two-year colleges faced when seeking private gifts and grants. Presumably, public two-year colleges faced a similar dilemma.

> The private junior colleges are in a difficult position. Institutions attract gifts from alumni, friends, and foundations. But private junior colleges

> are less apt to have rich alumni, and many alumni who are rich went on to get a bachelor's degree at a four-year college to which they have transferred their allegiance. Foundations and friends tend to give money to those institutions that are prestigious. The private universities have usually been able to do rather well at this, but many four-year liberal arts colleges have had considerable difficulty attracting gifts, and private junior colleges have had even more difficulty (9:76).

A preliminary review of the literature suggested that public two-year colleges had experienced little success in raising private funds. In 1979, Degerstedt (6) conducted a study of college-related separate foundations for two-year public colleges and determined that they had relatively small assets. These foundations reported that 14 percent had assets of less than $2,500 and 12 percent had assets of $100,000 or more. Moreover, foundations favored student aid in distribution of funds which, while directly helpful to students and indirectly helpful to colleges through presumably increased enrollment, was of no immediate help to improvement or development of programs and services of the public two-year college.

In 1982, Cohen and Brawer (5) reported on a study they had conducted on sources of income for public two-year colleges. They studied nine of the years between 1918 and 1980. Only in one of those years--1965--did public two-year colleges derive more than 1 percent of their income from private gifts and grants. In 1965, the peak year for income from that source, these colleges received 3 percent from private gifts and grants. The study did not include information about private gifts and grants made to

college-related separate foundations.

In the private sector, two-year public colleges were in competition with two-year private colleges and public and private four-year colleges and universities, all of which possessed a longer and more productive history of private giving from alumni, parents, friends, businesses and corporations, and foundations. Yet two-year public colleges entering the private-giving arena needed to understand their past history so they would not become discouraged when efforts yielded modest success. They needed to possess an historical perspective from which to view their relatively new ventures.

In July of 1983, The Marin Community Colleges initiated their first private fundraising campaign. The year-long campaign resulted in cash and non-cash gifts and grants of more than a quarter of a million dollars which was perceived by the Director of Public Affairs and Development as a successful first-year effort. However, because College faculty and staff lacked an historical perspective from which to view this new venture, they expressed frustration with the first-year results. It was perceived by the Director that this frustration might have been due to a discrepancy between what they expected to accomplish, and what they accomplished. It also was perceived by the Director that their continued frustration likely would lead some participants to abandon their efforts, rather than build on the first year's success. The Director only had

anecdotal information about the history of private support for public two-year colleges. A preliminary review of the literature revealed no single-source document which provided an historical perspective on the subject. The practicum was approriate to the seminar on The Emergence of Higher Education in America because it resulted in the development of a document which provided an historical perspective on the emergence of private financial support for public two-year colleges.

The review of the literature suggested that public two-year colleges faced unique challenges in developing programs of private support. The Marin Community Colleges faced an additional challenge: the college-related separate foundation wished to limit its private fundraising efforts for support of student aid. Yet The Colleges needed funds for programs and services. Faculty and staff also needed stronger congruence between expectations and reality so they would not abandon their efforts, but build on the first year's success.

PROCEDURES

Five procedures were used to conduct the study. These procedures were: (1) thirty journal articles and documents cited in the Dialog search for information regarding private financial support for public two-year colleges were reviewed, (2) twelve of these articles and documents were selected for relevance to the study and were

studied, (3) eight additional sources of information were identified and studied by searching in indexes for entries under the term "private financial support" in all of the books grouped under the subject of "community, junior and technical colleges" on the shelves at the San Francisco State University library, (4) a document was developed which provided an historical perspective on the emergence of private financial support for public two-year colleges, and (5) information contained in the document was used to develop an introductory chapter in a revised version of The Colleges' manual on policies and procedures for developing gifts and grants.

Limitations

This study was limited to a search for historical information about private financial support to public two-year colleges. It did not include a search for information about private financial support to college-related separate foundations. While some evidence existed which suggested that college-related separate foundations were more successful than public two-year colleges in developing private financial support, the fact that the Colleges of Marin Foundation limited itself to student aid made an historical perspective on private financial support to college-related foundations irrelevant to this study.

Assumptions

This study was based on the assumption that an historical perspective on private financial support would help faculty and staff at The Marin Community Colleges set realistic expectations regarding results of their efforts. The assumption also was made that realistic expectations would lead to less frustration and more likelihood that faculty and staff would continue their efforts.

RESULTS

In the study of the literature regarding the history of private financial support to public two-year colleges, only two authors made reference to any history prior to the year 1960. Duffy (7:1) stated that the first program of annual giving at a community college was established in 1906. Martorana (13:5) used National Center for Education Statistics data for 1955-56 to calculate the mean percentage distribution of financial support for community college operations nationwide. He found that the support derived from private gifts and grants was .8 percent of the total revenue.

Bremer and Elkins (1) reported on a study they conducted on private financial support of public community colleges during a three-year period, July 1960 through June 1963. They stated that their report contained the only information available at that time regarding philanthropy

for public community colleges. Survey instruments were sent to the 376 public community colleges in existence in 1960; 294 institutions reponded, a 78 percent return. Of the 294 institutions which responded, 131--45 percent--indicated that they had received no private financial support during the three-year period. The other 163 institutions reported an annual average of $38,863 for each college. The annual average for all colleges which responded was $21,547 per college for 1960-61, 1961-62, and 1962-63.

Bremer and Elkins found that the greatest concentration of private support went to community colleges in the Middle Atlantic and North Central regions of the nation. Ten of the 376 colleges in existence in 1960 received two-thirds of the private support. Six colleges received more than one million dollars. Thus, the bulk of the private support was concentrated in only a few institutions. They also found that colleges in the enrollment range of 300 to 1300 students received substantially more money per student than did the colleges with fewer than 300 or more than 1300 students.

According to the Bremer and Elkins study, foundations were the source of most of the private financial support to community colleges during 1960-63. They were followed, in rank order, by non-alumni, other, corporations and businesses, alumni, and religious denominations. Buildings and equipment received the most private support, followed, in rank order, by student scholarships,

unrestricted, general operating, student loan funds, other restricted, and books and manuscripts.

California community colleges completed and returned fifty-six survey instruments in the Bremer and Elkins study. They reported that they had received an annual average of $6,914 for each college from private sources during 1960-63. This average represented approximately one third of the national average of $21,547.

In 1965, the American Association of Junior Colleges and the American College Public Relations Association held a joint workshop in New York City on private funding available through general welfare foundations for community colleges. One of the speakers reported that public and private junior colleges received only 1.1 percent of foundation funds given to education during 1962-63 (8). Yet, according to Bremer and Elkins, foundations gave more money to community colleges during 1960-63 than any other source of private support.

Sharron (14:16) told a conference of community junior college presidents that, in 1967, public and private two-year colleges received only seven-tenths of 1 percent of private funds given to education by foundations. Further, most grants were made to private and religious two-year colleges, not to public community colleges. Sharron also told the presidents that two-year colleges received only $1.6 million in corporate funds in 1967.

According to Wattenbarger and Cage (18:12-13),

private support of community colleges increased substantially during the decade of the sixties. Donors included W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Ford Foundation, Carnegie Corporation, United States Steel, Sears Roebuck, and Esso Education Foundation. Meanwhile, private two-year colleges also increased their efforts. The president of Alice Lloyd College, a private junior college in Florida, claimed that the $400,000 it received in 1967-68 was "the largest amount of voluntary support for educational programs of any two-year college." (19:107-108)

A study of private gifts and grants made during 1967-68 found that public community colleges derived 5 percent of their income from endowment income, private gifts, other separately budgeted research (not federal, state, or local), nongovernmental sponsored programs, sales and services of educational departments, organized activities related to educational departments, other sources of educational and general revenue, private gifts and grants for student aid, endowment income for student aid, and other student aid grants. California community colleges reported that they derived only 2 percent of their income from these sources in 1971-71 (9:20-21).

Based on anecdotal research, Lombardi (12:53-54) concluded that community colleges had increased their efforts to gain private support beginning in the late 1960s. These efforts had resulted in contributions of equipment, land, and buildings, but funds for operations had been

"almost negligible." He stated that nearly every college with vocational-technical programs had received equipment or money from trade unions, businesses, industries, and trade associations. Donations consisted of a loan of equipment--new or used--or a sizeable price discount on materials purchased. He estimated that the value of these donations amounted to hundreds of thousands of dollars a year for colleges with large vocational-technical programs.

Hargis and Blocker (10) replicated the earlier study conducted by Bremer and Elkins for the new three-year period of July 1968 through June 1971. Survey instruments were sent to the 1091 junior colleges in existence in 1968; 650 institutions responded, or 60 percent. Of these 650 institutions, 546 were public two-year colleges; the rest were either independent or church-related colleges. During the three-year period under study, 1968-71, these public two-year colleges reported average annual private support of $85,450 per college--about four times the amount they reported eight years earlier.

According to the Hargis and Blocker study, books and manuscripts received the most support, followed, in rank order, by buildings and equipment, student scholarships, unrestricted, other, general operating, and student loan funds. The Bremer and Elkins study eight years earlier indicated that buildings and equipment received the most support and the least support went to books and manuscripts. Another finding of the study was that Alumni Funds at public

two-year colleges did not appear to be an effective aid to the development program. They stated that "the 506 public colleges not having an Alumni Fund reported $70.23 more income per student than public colleges with a Fund." (10:10)

Hargis and Blocker received completed survey instruments from sixty-seven California community colleges, sixty five of which were public. During the three-year period under study, these public community colleges reported average annual private support of $28,944. This average represented approximately one third of the national average of $85,450. In the previous study eight years earlier, the average annual private support of California community colleges also represented approximately one third of the national average. By contrast, another study (18:13) revealed that seventeen community colleges in New York state reported private support of $47,864 during 1970, more than half the national average.

As he had for 1955-56, Martorana (13:5) again used National Center for Education Statistics data for 1973-74 to calculate the mean percentage distribution of financial support for community college operations nationwide. This time he found that the support derived from private gifts and grants was .1 percent of the total revenue, as contrasted to the .8 percent derived from that source in 1955-56. According to a less comprehensive report (17), which used information from 108 private and public junior

colleges, they received average annual private support of $176,000 during 1973-74. This represented only 1.1 percent of all private funds raised by education that year. This same report presented a summary of data on voluntary support of education over a ten-year period which was provided by private and public junior colleges in an annual survey. The number of institutions responding ranged from 104 in 1975-76 to 158 in 1970-71. The average annual private support per college ranged from $133,000 in 1968-69 to $187,000 in 1972-73. According to this report, junior colleges received 1.8 percent of all private support raised by all educational institutions in 1969-70. In 1976-77, that percentage was .8.

The report also stated that, during 1976-77, the major source of private gifts to the 105 junior colleges responding to the survey was non-alumni. In rank order, other sources were religious denominations, other groups and sources, businesses and corporations, foundations, and alumni. Only 9.2 percent of private gifts came from alumni that year.

According to Woodbury (20), private per capita aid to public community colleges decreased 15.5 percent between 1972-73 and 1979-80. He used data from "Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education" published by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. During the same seven-year period, private two-year colleges experienced a 6.9 percent decrease per capita, public

four-year colleges experienced a 47.7 percent increase, and private four-year colleges a 49.8 percent increase. Endowment per capita aid during the same period resulted in no change for public community colleges, a 36.1 percent increase for four-year private colleges, and a 112.5 percent increase for four-year public colleges. According to Woodbury, "public community colleges received in per capita support from private sources one penny for each one dollar given to private four-year colleges." (20:22)

Cohen and Brawer (5) studied sources of revenue for public two-year colleges during nine of the years between 1918 and 1980. Only in one of those years--1965--did public two-year colleges derive more than 1 percent of their income from private gifts and grants. In 1965, the peak year for income from that source, these colleges received 3 percent of their revenue from private gifts and grants. Another study of private gifts made to two-year public colleges during 1981-82 (4), conducted by John Minter Associates, indicated that they received .6 percent of their revenue from private gifts. The study was based on a stratified random sample of 150 private and 150 public two and four-year colleges, with a 70 percent response rate.

The most recent study found in the literature was conducted by Jenkins (11:14-15). Information was compiled from a questionnaire completed by 120 two-year public college business officers in twenty-one states. The institutions surveyed were chosen at random from states that

also were chosen at random. Questions were asked regarding sources of revenue during four years: 1976-77, 1978-79, 1980-81, and 1982-83. The 120 two-year public colleges responding indicated that they derived from .12, .11, .21, and .20 percent of their revenue from private gifts, grants, and contracts during the four years studied. They also reported endowment income of .01, .01, .01, and .016 during the four years studied. Jenkins concluded that public community colleges which spend effort in fund-raising activities can expect a much higher percentage increase in revenue from these sources in the future.

A number of articles referred to specific gifts made to specific colleges. For instance, Three Rivers College in Missouri raised more than $300,000 in private gifts for buildings on a new permanent campus in the late 1970s (3:12-15). Edison Community College in Florida received private gifts of "time, talent, and money" to establish a Gallery of Fine Arts (15:21-12). And Carteret Technical College in North Carolina received $75,000 in private funds for a civic center located on its campus (2:30-32).

A documented historical perspective on private financial support for public two-year colleges resulted from the procedures of the study. Major findings included: (1) the history of private giving to public two-year colleges was less than eighty years old; (2) as a percent of total revenue, private gifts and grants accounted for no more than 3 percent of public two-year college revenue with no clear

trend emerging; (3) individual public two-year colleges received an average of $85,450 each year from private gifts and grants during 1968-71, the last years for which accurate data were available;(4) anecdotal research indicated that some public two-year colleges received $300,000 in gifts and grants in a given year, and that one private two-year college received $400,000 in gifts and grants in 1967-68; (5) non-alumni were the largest source of private gifts during the last years for which accurate data were available; (6) Alumni Funds were not effective in raising private gifts for public two-year colleges; (7) books and manuscripts received the highest level of support during the last years for which accurate data were available; and (8) California community colleges tended to receive about one third the average dollar amount that community colleges across the nation received.

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the study indicated that public community colleges, in their short history of private financial support, experienced several differences from that of four-year colleges and universities. One difference was that alumni were not a major source of private gifts for public two-year colleges. Friends of the colleges were the major source of private gifts. Another difference was that Alumni Funds were not effective in raising private gifts for public two-year colleges. Both of these differences

supported Garms' portrait of the dilemma facing the private junior college which, presumably, public two-year colleges faced as well. According to Garms, ". . .private junior colleges are less apt to have rich alumni, and many alumni who are rich went on to get a bachelor's degree at a four-year college to which they have transferred their allegiance."

California community colleges experienced less support than other community colleges across the nation, particularly those located in the Middle Atlantic and North Central regions. However, at least during the early 1960s, the bulk of the private support was concentrated in only a few institutions in those regions. While no details were available in the literature, it is possible that these few institutions were older, well established colleges, as contrasted to the newer community colleges in California. It also is possible that, until recently, California community colleges received adequate public funding which gave them little, if any, motivation to seek private support.

Anecdotal research indicated that some public two-year colleges received $300,000 in gifts and grants in a given year. During its first year of private fundraising, The Marin Community Colleges received $265,000 in cash and non-cash gifts and grants. Based on the average dollar increase experienced by public two-year colleges from 1960 through 1970, and projected from 1970 through 1984, The

Marin Community Colleges received 19 percent more private support than the average amount received by public two-year colleges across the nation. Using a similar projection for California community colleges only, The Marin Community Colleges received 248 percent more private support than the average amount received by public two-year colleges in California.

Several implications can be drawn from the results of the study. One is that The Marin Community Colleges did extremely well during the first year of their private fundraising effort; participants can be proud of their results. Another is that the techniques and strategies utilized in the 1983-84 campaign were effective. While some evidence existed which suggested that public two-year colleges were not as effective at private fundraising as college-related separate foundations, The Marin Community Colleges' first-year experience did not support that hypothesis. The results of the study also indicated that public two-year college alumni were the source of less support than any other source. The Marin Community Colleges also received little support from alumni in their first-year effort. While it is not clear whether efforts were made by other community colleges to solicit support from alumni, The Marin Community Colleges made no concerted attempt to do so, primarily because of the difficulty in locating current addresses of alumni. A third implication is that a target of 3 percent of total college revenue from private sources

is optimistic, but not impossible for a public two-year college to achieve. For The Marin Community Colleges, that target for 1983-84 would have been approximately $570,000.

Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that:

1. The major findings of the study should become the introductory chapter in a revised version of The Colleges' manual on policies and procedures for developing gifts and grants;

2. The major findings of the study should be printed in The Marin Community Colleges' employee and trustee newsletter;

3. The Marin Community Colleges should continue to focus on developing gifts and grants from friends of The Colleges, rather than alumni;

4. The Marin Community Colleges should continue to organize its private fundraising efforts through The Colleges, unless the Colleges of Marin Foundation decides to change its single-purpose mission of raising funds for student aid;

5. The Marin Community Colleges should gradually increase its annual private fundraising goal until it approximates at least 3 percent of The Colleges' total revenue.

The development of an historical perspective on private financial support for public two-year colleges has the potential to assist participants in the private

fundraising effort at The Marin Community Colleges take pride in their first-year efforts. It also has the potential to assist participants reduce the discrepancy between what they expect to accomplish, and what they accomplish in future years, thereby reducing frustration and enhancing the likelihood that they will continue their efforts. A strong program of private financial support to The Marin Community Colleges will assist The Colleges maintain adequate support for programs and services for many years to come.

REFERENCES CITED

1. Bremer, Fred H., and Floyd S. Elkins. Private Financial Support of Public Community Colleges. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 011 764, 1965.

2. Bryant, Donald W. "Creative Linkages Leverage Big Bucks for Building." Community and Junior College Journal. 54:30-32, February, 1984.

3. Burke, Tom. "Using Innovative Fund Raising to Create a Campus." Community and Junior College Journal. 52:12-15, November, 1981.

4. Chronicle of Higher Education. February 9, 1983.

5. Cohen, Arthur B., and Florence B. Brawer. The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

6. Degerstedt, Lynn M. "The Strategies and Perceptions of Community Colleges and the Foundation: A National Perspective." The Community College Foundation. Washington, D. C.: National Council for Resource Development, 1982.

7. Duffy, Edward F. Characteristics and Conditions of a Successful Community College Foundation. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 203 918, 1980.

8. Foundations and the Junior College: Report of a Workshop for Junior College Institutional Teams. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 014 976, 1965.

9. Garms, Walter I. Financing Community Colleges. New York: Teachers Press, 1977.

10. Hargis, W. Douglas, and Clyde E. Blocker. Philanthropy to Junior Colleges: A Comparative Study, 1960-63 and 1968-71. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 081 418, 1973.

11. Jenkins, Joe. "More Dollars from Private Sector: Future Funding Trend." Community and Junior College Journal. 54:24-25, February, 1984.

12. Lombardi, John. Managing Finances in Community Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

13. Martorana, S. V. "Shifting Patterns of Financial Support." New Directions for Community Colleges: Coping With Reduced Resources. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Summer, 1978.

14. Sharron, W. Harvey. External Funding: Federal and Private. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 060 834, July, 1971.

15. Smith, Nanette J. "Gifts of Time, Talent--and Money." Community and Junior College Journal. 52:21-23, November, 1981.

16. Thornton, James W., Jr. The Community Junior College. 3rd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972.

17. Voluntary Support of Education, 1976-77. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 206 205, May, 1978.

18. Wattenbarger, James L., and Bob N. Cage. More Money for More Opportunity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

19. Wiegman, Robert R. The Care and Feeding of the Community Junior College: Proceedings of the Annual Junior College Administrative Team Institute. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 019 050, 1967.

20. Woodbury, Kenneth B. "Fair Share of Funding Unmet Goal for Colleges." Community and Junior College Journal. 53:22-25, March, 1983.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

MAR 22 1985